**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

Terms of Reference for the Appointment of International Consultant for the Terminal Evaluation of the GEF-funded project entitled “Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation (PIMS 4755) implemented through the Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM)”

**TITLE:**  International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of the OKACOM Project

SECTOR: International Waters

# LOCATION: Regional Africa (Angola, Botswana and Namibia)

DUTY STATION: Botswana – Lead country

DURATION: 35 working days

STARTING DATE: 3 December 2021

END DATE: 5 March 2021

1. **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full-sized project titled Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation (PIMS 4755) implemented through the Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM). The project started on the 1st February 2018 and is in its fourth (4) year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ (insert hyperlink).

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT`**

The Cubango-Okavango River Basin ecosystem is a near-pristine which is very much rare in large river basins globally. It is a system shared by the three riparian states of Angola, Botswana and Namibia In its present near-pristine status, the river provides significant ecosystem benefits and support the social, economic and environmental sustenance of its people and the environment. Such benefits will continue to be accrued only if the system is managed appropriately. However, pressures are now building to develop the basin's resources to increase incomes and alleviate poverty in the basin population. This calls for joint management approaches to the development, management and utilization of the basin.

The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM) and UNDP with finance from GEF produced a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) which is a technical assessment of the basin, including the future water resources development analysis. The TDA identified threats to the system form which a set of priority interventions were identified to respond to the identified threats. These set of transboundary priorities for the sustainable development and management of the basin culminated into a 20year Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the basin. .

UNDP-GEF with OKACOM, further designed a project to support the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Cubango-Okavango River Basin (CORB) with the objective *to strengthen the joint management and cooperative decision making capacity of the Cubango-Okavango River basin states on the optimal utilization of natural resources in the basin, with the aim to support the socio-economic development of the basin communities while sustaining the health of the basin ecosystems.* This will be achieved through three components. These are; Component 1: Basin Development Management Framework strengthening; Component 2: Environmentally Conscious Livelihoods and Socio-Economic Development Demonstration Projects; and Component 3: Integrated Water Resource Management.

It is expected that the project will yield four outputs and associated targets as follows;

* Outcome 1: A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space;
* Outcome 2: Strengthened management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates;
* Outcome 3: Environmentally sound socioeconomic development demonstrated in the basin to allow the basin population to improve their socio-economic status with minimum adverse impacts to and enhanced protection of the basin ecosystem; and
* Outcome 4: The basin’s states capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) principles enhanced, supporting the Basin Development Management Framework (BDMF).

The project duration is 4.5 years from November 2017 to July 2022 with a total budget of 6.1 million USD and planned co-financing of 336 million USD from the member states contributions, international cooperating partners and private sector.

**Institutional arrangements of the project, relevant partners and stakeholders**

The project is implemented by UNDP and executed by OKACOM, an Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) established by the riparian countries of the Cubango-Okavango river basin through the Project Management Unit (PMU) based at the OKACOM Secretariat. The PMU is comprised of a Project Manager, Project Administrative and Finance Officer, Coordinator for the Livelihoods and Socio- 4 Economic Demonstration Projects. For the project implementation to follow as closely as possible to the OKACOM’s institutional structure, specific project governance structure were established as follows;

* The Project Steering Committee (PSC) has three roles : (i) the **Executive** (OKACOM), who is the primary custodians of the project, representing the project ownership to chair the group; (ii) the **Senior Supplier** (UNDP, including UNDP-GEF), representing the interests of the parties concerned which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project; and (iii) the **Beneficiary** (s), representing the interests of those who will ultimately benefit from the project, to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries.

The PSC’s act as the highest decision-making body for the project, to review the project progress, approve annual plans, budgets, technical and financial reports. It further provides strategic guidance and policy directions to project implementation and to ensure that, the project is well aligned to national policies and priorities of the countries and the basin it supports. In addition, the PSC plays a critical role in UNDP commissioned project evaluations by assuring quality evaluation process and products. It is composed of (i) UNDP Resident Representative (Supplier), (ii) UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (Supplier), (iii) OKACOM (Executive), represented by the three Commissioners from the respective member states and the Executive Secretary; and (iv) Beneficiaries representatives (the role assumed by the Heads of the Delegations to the Commission and/or appointed separately by the above members as appropriate).

* The Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG) assures the PSC that the project is being implemented effectively, ensures the quality of technical outputs from the project, and assists in the implementation of national and regional activities. It supports OKACOM Secretariat to coordinate the UNDP-GEF project with other OKACOM initiatives supported by other partners and/or carried out by the countries or OKACOM themselves to ensure the effective delivery of the OKACOM Programme and the CORB SAP Implementation. The RTAG comprises: (i) OKACOM, represented by the Okavango Basin Steering Committee (OBSC), (ii) OKACOM Secretariat, and (iii) UNDP. However, the RTAG may include various stakeholders and partners, such as representatives from other International Cooperating Partners, Civil Society Organizations active in the basin, private sectors, and/or government representatives from Regional and Local Councils in the basin, as appropriate.
* The Technical Working Groups (TWGs) with the aim to provide sound scientific and technical advice to project implementation processes, in conjunction with the OKACOM Technical Committees. The roles and responsibilities of the TWGs includes: (i) ensuring the technical quality of the final project deliverables through the review of ToRs and project deliverables at the draft stage, as requested by the Project Manager and/or RTWG, (ii) critically examine submitted consultancy and research work to ensure product quality, and (iii) serve as a source of objective technical advice to all those involved at the policy, planning, management and implementation levels. The TWGs are accountable to the RTAG and accessible to the PMU (entrusted to contribute in their respective areas of expertise).

The outbreak of the COVID 19 pandemic in December 2019 has had significant impact on the economies and the day-day life of countries worldwide. The riparian countries of the Cubango-Okavango basin are no exception. The basin recorded significant numbers of cases, recoveries and deaths. As of 27th October 2021, Angola recorded 62606 cases,50584 recoveries and 1660 deaths Botswana recorded 186,594 cases, 182,928 recoveries and 2406 deaths, while Namibia has 128,880 cases , 124,536 recoveries, and 3550 deaths. The countries in response to the pandemic implemented national lockdowns, imposed curfews, restricted gatherings and meetings. These restricted movement within countries and internationally.

The COVID-19 pandemic-related restrictions affected activity implementation and meeting timelines for deliverables as most project activities required sites visits and consultations with stakeholders. Groups meetings were restricted, therefore a lot of consultations done virtually or not held at all. Virtual engagements had its own limitations as not all had the required technology to do so. There we disruptions in delivery of goods and services which the project required for implementation. The conservation agriculture in Angola for instance was delayed as farming implements and materials could not be transported to recipients. Procurement of consultants to deliver services and conduct assessment became a challenge as international and regional, in some cases even local consultants were travel restricted. Where it was possible to travel, it became very costly to the project as certain health protocols had to be adhered to including COVID 19 test, procuring masks and sanitizers. A cost that was not budgeted for in the project. Therefore, a year and half of project timeline has been lost in project implementation. The terminal evaluation as was with the mid-term evaluation, will be affected by the restrictions as relates to sites visits and consultations with stakeholders.

1. **TE PURPOSE**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency, and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

It is anticipated that lessons learnt in implementing the project will be documented especially with the demonstration project undertaken within component 3 of the project. Therefore, the TE will accord OKACOM opportunity to upscale and replicate these activities in continuation of the implementation of the SAP which is in its 10th year of implementation.

The TE is undertaken at the final or end stages of the project timelines, mostly within the final six (6) months of the operational closure of the project. While this is appropriate, it will be important to consider the unexpected challenges brought about by COVID 19. The project adopted some interventions in response such as conducting consultations and meetings virtually, doubling up of the PMU and OKASEC staff work load to undertake certain activities which could have otherwise been done by consultants. The time frame of the project was affected as limited implementation was done during times of lockdowns and movement restrictions. The TE process should take these into account and be part of the evaluation scope.

1. **TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to OKACOM relevant structures (Secretariat, Commissioners or Okavango Basin Steering Committee - OBSC co-chairs, relevant technical committees), relevant International Cooperating Partners (European Union funded project, USAID Resilient Waters Program, The Nature Conservancy, Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility – CRIDF, among others), and local communities / beneficiaries of the demonstration projects; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to Angola, Botswana and Namibia, including the following project sites Calai and Menongue in Angola, Maun and Shakawe (in Botswana), Rundu and Khaudum National Park in Namibia. Should the COVID 19 restrictions remain, virtual tools such as telephonic and video engagements will be implored to engage with stakeholders at the project sites.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team. The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

Although travel restrictions have been lifted in all the three participating countries, it is not a guarantee that the situation will be the same by the time of TE mission since COVID 19 continues to spread. Should there be change, TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit. In this regard, consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely and, their accessibility to the internet/computer. The limitations of this approach must be clearly articulated in the final TE report.

The planning stage of this scenario is very important as it assumes that the International consultant will be home – based assisted by national consultants that may be able to visit the sites and conduct interviews. This will require that appropriate technological and ICT arrangements are made in advance with PMU providing that support. If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). It is a priority to ensure that no stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety. This will be ensured by full compliance to the Governments of Angola, Botswana and Namibia laid out COVID 19 regulations.

1. **DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE**

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects [*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP\_Evaluation\_Guidelines.pdf*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf).

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex C. The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

1. Project Design/Formulation

* National priorities and country driven-ness
* Theory of Change
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Social and Environmental Safeguards
* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements

1. Project Implementation

* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

1. Project Results

* Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
* Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
* Sustainability: financial (\*) , socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

* The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
* The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
* The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
* It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 35 working days over a time period of 16 weeks starting on 3 December 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| The GPN Roster will be used | Application closes |
| 17 Nov – 3 Dec 2021 | Selection of TE team (review of CVs, Contact expert for interest and availability, contract development and signing) |
| 6 – 7 Dec 2021 (2 days) | Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) |
| 8-15 Dec 2021 (6 days) | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| (17 - 18 Jan 2022) 2 days | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
| (24 Jan - 6 Feb 2022) 14 days | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc. the missions will be carried across 3 countries. |
| 8 Feb 2022 (1 day) | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| 9 – 15 Feb 2022 (7 days) | Preparation of draft TE report |
| 16 Feb 2022 (1 day) | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| 28 Feb - 5 Mar 2022 (2 days) | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report |
| 25 Apr 2022 (within 6 weeks after final report) | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
| *(date)* | Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional) |
| *(date)* | Expected date of full TE completion |

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report and the timeframe adjusted accordingly.

1. **TE DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
| 1 | TE Inception Report | TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE | No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission:  15 Dec 2021 | TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of TE mission:  8 Feb 2021 | TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)* with annexes | Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: 15 Feb 2022 | TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 5 | Final TE Report\* + Audit Trail | Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report *(See template in ToR Annex H)* | Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 3 Mar 2022 | TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit |

\*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. **TE ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is UNDP Botswana Country Office (CO).

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators (support from UNDP Angola CO will be provided for the recruitment of a National Consultant from Angola to support in Angolan part of the basin and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **TE TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two (2) independent consultants will conduct the TE - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and 1 expert from Angola to provide technical support and bridge the language barrier. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report. The team experts will be responsible for stakeholder consultations and undertaking site visits at respective countries.

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document), have not conducted this project Mid-Term Review should and not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities. The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the areas indicate

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the areas indicated below, for the International Consultant (Team Leader) the qualification, experience, and technical expertise and competencies of the applicants will be evaluated using the criteria indicated below; thus, it is important that the relevant expertise and experience are highlighted in the applications. The overall assessment rating is out of 100*.*

**Education (Yes or No)**

* Minimum a master’s degree in natural resources management, water resources management, natural sciences, environmental management, environment, development studies, or other closely related field; (20 points)

Professional Experiences (100*):*

* Previous work experience in trans-boundary water management, integrated water management, biodiversity and ecosystems, hydrology or related fields for at least 10 years; (10 points);
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to international waters; (10 points);
* Experience in evaluation of UNDP-GEF funded projects (MSP and/or FSP); (40 points);
* Experience working in SADC region, exposure into the basin riparian states is an added value; (10 points);
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and international waters/transboundary water management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (10 points)
* Project evaluation/review experiences of international development partner and United Nations system is considered an asset; (10 points)
* Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset (10).

Language **(Yes or No):**

* Excellent English communication and report writing skills and knowledge of Portuguese is desirable

1. **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

* 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

* The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
* The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
* The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid. However, due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[4]](#footnote-4) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[5]](#footnote-5));
3. Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address The Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme P.O. Box 54 Gaborone, Botswana in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for the Terminal Evaluation of *Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation project* ” or by email at the following address ONLY: OR by email to [procurement.bw@undp.org](mailto:procurement.bw@undp.org) by 12 noon Botswana time (GMT+2) by the XX XXX 2021. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

1. **TOR ANNEXES**

* ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
* ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by
* ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
* ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
* ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
* ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
* ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
* ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

**ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**

*(Insert the project’s results framework)*

**ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) |
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |
| 3 | Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes |
| 4 | CEO Endorsement Request |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations |
| 8 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 9 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 10 | Oversight mission reports |
| 11 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 12 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 13 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 14 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 15 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 16 | Audit reports |
| 17 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 18 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 19 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 20 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities |
| 21 | List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information) |
| 22 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 23 | Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available |
| 24 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 25 | List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits |
| 26 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 27 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |
|  | *Add documents, as required* |

**ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**

1. Title page

* Tile of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
* UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
* TE timeframe and date of final TE report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
* Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
* TE Team members

1. Acknowledgements
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)

* Project Information Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Ratings Table
* Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
* Recommendations summary table

1. Introduction (2-3 pages)

* Purpose and objective of the TE
* Scope
* Methodology
* Data Collection & Analysis
* Ethics
* Limitations to the evaluation
* Structure of the TE report

1. Project Description (3-5 pages)

* Project start and duration, including milestones
* Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
* Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Expected results
* Main stakeholders: summary list
* Theory of Change

1. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating[[6]](#footnote-6))

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* UNDP implementation/oversight (\*) and Implementing Partner execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
  1. Project Results
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Overall Outcome (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender
* Other Cross-cutting Issues
* Social and Environmental Standards
* Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* Country Ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting Issues
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to Impact

1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned

1. Annexes

* TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* TE Mission itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Summary of field visits
* Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
* TE Rating scales
* Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
* Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
* Signed TE Report Clearance form
* *Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail
* *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

**ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level? | | | |
| *(include evaluative questions)* | *(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)* | *(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)* | *(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| *(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)* | | | |

**ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project’s Mid-Term Review.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance | Sustainability ratings: |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings  5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings  4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings  3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings  2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings  1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings  Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment | 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability  3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability  2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability  1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability  Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability |

**ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) **Reviewed and Cleared By:**  **Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

*The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.*

**To the comments received on** *(date)* **from the Terminal Evaluation of *Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation******(PIMS 4755)***

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator’s name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/**  **Organization** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team**  **response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)